

Quantum Gowdy T^3 model: A uniqueness result

Alejandro Corichi,^{1,2,*} Jerónimo Cortez,^{3,†} Guillermo

A. Mena Marugán,^{3,‡} and José M. Velhinho^{4,§}

¹*Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,*

A. Postal 61-3, Morelia, Michoacán 58090, Mexico.

²*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,*

A. Postal 70-543, México D.F. 04510, Mexico.

³*Instituto de Estructura de la Materia,*

CSIC, Serrano 121, 28006 Madrid, Spain.

⁴*Departamento de Física, Universidade da Beira Interior,*

R. Marquês D'Ávila e Bolama, 6201-001 Covilhã, Portugal.

Modulo a homogeneous degree of freedom and a global constraint, the linearly polarised Gowdy T^3 cosmologies are equivalent to a free scalar field propagating in a fixed nonstationary background. Recently, a new field parameterisation was proposed for the metric of the Gowdy spacetimes such that the associated scalar field evolves in a flat background in 1+1 dimensions with the spatial topology of S^1 , although subject to a time dependent potential. Introducing a suitable Fock quantisation for this scalar field, a quantum theory was constructed for the Gowdy model in which the dynamics is implemented as a unitary transformation. A question that was left open is whether one might adopt a different, nonequivalent Fock representation by selecting a distinct complex structure. The present work proves that the chosen Fock quantisation is in fact unique (up to unitary equivalence) if one demands unitary implementation of the dynamics and invariance under the group of S^1 -translations. These translations are precisely those generated by the global constraint that remains on the Gowdy model. It is also shown that the proof of uniqueness in the choice of complex structure can be applied to more general field dynamics than that corresponding to the Gowdy cosmologies.

PACS numbers: 04.62.+v, 04.60.Ds, 98.80.Qc

1. INTRODUCTION

The quantisation of systems which possess fieldlike degrees of freedom involves choices that generally lead to inequivalent theories within the standard Hilbert space approach [1]. Opposite to the situation found for systems with a finite dimensional linear phase space, where the Stone-von Neumann theorem guarantees that any two strongly continuous, irreducible and unitary representations of the Weyl relations are unitarily equivalent [2], in quantum field theory no general uniqueness theorem can be invoked. Therefore, additional criteria are needed to select a preferred representation of the canonical commutation relations. For instance, in background independent quantum gravity [3, 4, 5], the requirement of spatial diffeomorphism invariance provides a unique representation of the kinematical holonomy-flux algebra [6]. For field theories in Minkowski spacetime, the criterion of Poincaré invariance is naturally employed to arrive at a unique representation. In particular, if the field theory corresponds to a Klein-Gordon field, Poincaré invariance selects a complex structure (which is the mathematical object that encodes the ambiguity in the quantisation) and thus picks out a preferred representation of the Weyl relations [7]. In fact, even when the Klein-Gordon field propagates in a more general but still stationary spacetime, a preferred complex structure can be selected by imposing the energy criterion introduced in [8]. In spite of these examples, it should be emphasised that, in generic curved spacetimes, no uniqueness criteria exist and field theories generally admit infinitely many unitarily inequivalent representations.

In the framework of canonical quantum gravity, symmetry reduced models have been very useful to discuss conceptual and technical issues in a concrete arena. Though the reduction is drastic for the so-called minisuperspace models [9], in the sense that only a finite number of degrees of freedom remain in the system, midisuperspace models [10] still retain the field complexity of general relativity after symmetry reduction, possessing local degrees of freedom. As a consequence, midisuperspace models have to face the inherent ambiguity that is associated with the quantisation of fields. In particular, in order to

*Electronic address: corichi@matmor.unam.mx

†Electronic address: jacq@iem.cfmac.csic.es

‡Electronic address: mena@iem.cfmac.csic.es

§Electronic address: jvelhi@ubi.pt

deal with their quantisation, one has to address the question of the unitary equivalence of representations and investigate whether there exist physical criteria that select a preferred one. In the present work, we shall analyse the uniqueness of the Fock quantisation of a particularly interesting midisuperspace model, namely, the model introduced in [11, 12] for the description of the linearly polarised Gowdy T^3 cosmologies [13].

These cosmologies provide the simplest of all inhomogeneous (spatially closed) cosmological systems. They are vacuum spacetimes whose spatial sections have the topology of a three-torus and which possess two commuting, spacelike and hypersurface orthogonal Killing vector fields [13]. As a midisuperspace model, this family of cosmologies has local gravitational degrees of freedom that are described just by one scalar field. The classical solutions correspond to spacetimes with a big-bang singularity. Therefore, the model supplies a nontrivial cosmological scenario where one can study fundamental questions about canonical quantum gravity and quantum field theory in curved spacetime. This explains the interest that has been paid in the literature to its quantisation [11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21].

The first preliminary attempts to construct a quantum version of these cosmologies and obtain physical predictions date back to the seventies [14, 15]. The problem was later revisited within the nonperturbative quantisation framework by using Ashtekar variables [16, 17]. Nonetheless, it was only recently that real progress was achieved in defining a complete quantisation [18]. However, it was almost immediately noticed that, in the Fock quantisation put forward in [18], the dynamics cannot be implemented as a unitary transformation, neither on the kinematical [19, 20] nor on the physical [21] Hilbert space. This failure of unitarity precludes the availability of a Schrödinger picture with a conventional notion of probability preserved by the evolution [21, 22]. In order to reconcile the quantisation of the linearly polarised Gowdy model with the standard probabilistic interpretation of quantum physics, an alternative nonperturbative canonical quantisation of the model was recently proposed in [11, 12]. In this new Fock quantisation, the dynamics is indeed unitary. In this sense, this is the first available example of a consistent quantisation of an inhomogeneous cosmological system.

In the description of the model proposed in [11], the quantisation of the local gravitational degrees of freedom is obtained by exploiting the equivalence of the classical solutions with those corresponding to a real scalar field in a fictitious background. More

precisely, once the classical system has been (almost completely) gauge fixed and a choice of internal time has been made, the spacetimes are characterised, modulo a remaining global constraint, by a “point particle” degree of freedom and by a real scalar field ξ . The point particle degree of freedom has a trivial evolution (it corresponds to a canonical pair of constants of motion). Moreover, it plays no role in the discussion of the uniqueness of the quantisation, since this only affects systems with an infinite number of degrees of freedom. We shall hence restrict our analysis from now on to the field sector of the model.

The field ξ is subject to a time dependent potential $V(\xi) = \xi^2/(4t^2)$ and propagates in a fictitious flat spacetime in 1+1 dimensions whose spatial slices have circular topology^[¶], $\mathcal{M} \approx \mathbb{R}^+ \times S^1$. This evolution is governed by the time dependent Hamiltonian^[**]

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \oint \left[P_\xi^2 + (\xi')^2 + \frac{\xi^2}{4t^2} \right] d\theta, \quad (1)$$

where $\theta \in S^1$ is the spatial coordinate, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the time coordinate and the prime denotes the derivative with respect to θ . In addition, P_ξ is the momentum canonically conjugate to ξ . So, the symplectic structure Ω on the field sector of the canonical phase space is

$$\Omega([\xi_1, P_{\xi_1}], [\xi_2, P_{\xi_2}]) = \oint (\xi_2 P_{\xi_1} - \xi_1 P_{\xi_2}) d\theta. \quad (2)$$

The Hamiltonian equations of motion are then

$$\dot{\xi} = P_\xi, \quad \dot{P}_\xi = \xi'' - \frac{\xi}{4t^2}, \quad (3)$$

where the dot stands for the derivative with respect to t . Thus, in agreement with our previous comments, the field satisfies the second order equation

$$\ddot{\xi} - \xi'' + \frac{\xi}{4t^2} = 0. \quad (4)$$

It is worth noticing that, since the Hamiltonian does not depend on θ , the field equations are invariant under constant S^1 -translations,

$$T_\alpha : \theta \mapsto \theta + \alpha \quad \forall \alpha \in S^1. \quad (5)$$

[¶] One may alternatively consider an axially symmetric field propagating in a 2+1 dimensional background with the spatial topology of a two-torus, $\mathcal{M} \approx \mathbb{R}^+ \times T^2$ [11, 12]. For simplicity, we here adopt the 1+1 dimensional perspective.

[**] We employ a system of units with $c = 4G/\pi = 1$, c and G being the speed of light and Newton’s constant, respectively.

Furthermore, in the present case the translations T_α ^[††] are in fact gauge symmetries, because the system is subject to a global constraint which is precisely their generator [11, 12]:

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \oint P_\xi \xi' d\theta = 0. \quad (6)$$

The quantisation of the field sector of the model reduces then to a quantum theory of the scalar field ξ in the above mentioned flat background. The quantum Gowdy model introduced in [11, 12] is defined by using a representation for ξ on a fiducial Fock space, resulting in a unitary implementation of the dynamics as well as of the gauge group of S^1 -translations. This automatically provides a quantisation of the global constraint C_0 , since this is the generator of the group of translations (and we consider exclusively weakly continuous unitary implementations of this group). The constraint can then be imposed to obtain the physical Hilbert space. One can show that the dynamics is also unitarily implemented on this space of quantum physical states [11, 12].

In order to arrive at the quantum theory obtained in [11, 12] for the Gowdy model, three important choices are made that may affect the final outcome [11, 12]. The first one is the choice of deparameterisation, owing to the compact nature of the spatial sections. This choice introduces a fictitious (internal) time that provides the notion of time evolution. In spite of the inherent ambiguity in this choice, the time selected is certainly the most natural candidate, since it corresponds to the square root of the determinant of the metric induced on the group orbits that are spanned by the two Killing vectors, and the timelike character of the gradient of this function is invariant under coordinate transformations [23]. The second one is the choice of a field parameterisation for the spatial metric, which results in the freedom to perform time dependent canonical transformations of the field ξ and its momentum after the deparameterisation of the system [12]. We assume that this field parameterisation has been fixed (at least as far as time dependent canonical transformations are concerned). The consequences of adopting other field parameterisations will be analysed elsewhere.

Once the above choices have been made, the quantisation put forward in [11, 12] is of the Fock type, i.e. the GNS state that defines the representation of the kinematical

[††] In the following, we will obviate the word “constant” when referring to these translations, understanding that the angle α is independent of the spacetime position.

Weyl algebra is defined by a Hilbert space structure in phase space (or in the space of smooth solutions), which in turn is uniquely defined by a complex structure. This is the third choice that may affect the quantisation. Although the chosen complex structure is a natural candidate and endows the quantisation with amenable properties, the question arises of whether a different selection of complex structure might lead to a different, (unitarily) nonequivalent quantisation which could still be physically acceptable. This is the issue that we shall investigate in the present work. We shall show that, under reasonable requirements, the quantisation put forward in [11, 12] is unique.

In particular, these requirements concern the unitary implementation of the group of gauge transformations (5). Since this group can be implemented in a natural invariant way, i.e. there are states of the Weyl algebra that are invariant under translations, we restrict our discussion exclusively to such states and the corresponding representations. So, we consider only Fock representations for which the group of S^1 -translations belongs to the unitary group of the one-particle Hilbert space. This amounts to restricting one's attention to complex structures that are left invariant under those translations.

Our result is thus that any Fock quantisation defined by a translation invariant complex structure that provides a unitary implementation of the dynamics is unitarily equivalent to that proposed in [11, 12].

In addition, we shall see that our proof of uniqueness of the Fock quantisation may actually be extended to more general dynamics than the one corresponding to the real scalar field ξ in the case of the Gowdy model. For instance, the proof is valid for a free massless field propagating in the same flat background in 1+1 dimensions.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 summarises the quantisation of the Gowdy model introduced in [11, 12] to attain a unitary implementation of the dynamics ^[‡‡] and introduces the notation that will be employed in our discussion. In section 3 we determine the complex structures that are invariant under S^1 -translations

[‡‡] Another midisuperspace where unitarity problems have been found are the linearly polarised cylindrical waves [24]. Actually the detected problems, which affect the implementation of radial diffeomorphisms, can be solved in a way similar to that explained for the Gowdy model in [11], though changing the roles of the time and spatial coordinates (namely, by scaling the fundamental scalar field by a function of the radial coordinate). It would be interesting to see whether the uniqueness of the corresponding Fock quantisation results from the demand of unitarity on time evolution and radial diffeomorphisms, generalising the present analysis to the context of parameterised field theory.

and show that they are all related by a specific family of symplectic transformations. Section 4 contains the proof of the uniqueness of the invariant complex structure (up to unitary transformations of the Fock representation) under the requirement that the dynamics admit a unitary implementation. This proof is not restricted to the case of the Gowdy model, but applies to a broader class of field dynamics satisfying certain conditions. In section 5 we show that such conditions are indeed fulfilled by the field evolution corresponding to the linearly polarised Gowdy cosmologies. We present our conclusions and some further comments in section 6. Finally, in the appendix we give alternative uniqueness criteria, imposing the stronger requirement of a well defined action of the Hamiltonian on the vacuum of the Fock representation, instead of the unitary implementation of the dynamics.

2. THE QUANTUM GOWDY MODEL

In this section we shall briefly review the Fock quantisation of the linearly polarised Gowdy T^3 model that was constructed in [11, 12], emphasising those aspects that will be important for our analysis.

By exploiting the periodicity in the spatial coordinate θ , we first expand the canonical fields ξ and P_ξ in Fourier series:

$$\xi(\theta, t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \xi_n(t) \frac{e^{in\theta}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}, \quad P_\xi(\theta, t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} P_\xi^n(t) \frac{e^{in\theta}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \quad (7)$$

Note that the (implicitly time dependent) Fourier coefficients ξ_n and P_ξ^{-n} are canonically conjugate and that $\xi_n^* = \xi_{-n}$ and $(P_\xi^n)^* = P_\xi^{-n}$ because the scalar field $\xi(\theta, t)$ and its momentum are real. The symbol $*$ denotes complex conjugation. Since neither the unitary implementation of the dynamics and gauge group (5), on the one hand, nor the unitary equivalence of the different representations, on the other hand, depend on a finite number of degrees of freedom, we shall obviate the zero mode in the following for convenience. For the rest of modes we introduce the set of complex phase space coordinates

$$\{B_m = (b_m, b_{-m}^*, b_{-m}, b_m^*), m \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad (8)$$

which are given by

$$b_m = \frac{m\xi_m + iP_\xi^m}{\sqrt{2m}}, \quad b_{-m}^* = \frac{m\xi_m - iP_\xi^m}{\sqrt{2m}}, \quad (9)$$

whereas b_{-m} and b_m^* are the complex conjugate of b_{-m}^* and b_m , respectively. The coordinates (b_m, b_m^*) and (b_{-m}, b_{-m}^*) are pairs of annihilationlike and creationlike variables. Here, $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of all strictly positive integers. In the following, we shall treat B_m as a column vector for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is worth pointing out that in the definition of this vector we have adopted a slightly different order than that employed for the similar vector $\mathcal{B}_m$ in [12]. The order chosen here will simplify our expressions.

The above variables have very simple transformation properties under the translations T_α , namely

$$b_m \mapsto e^{im\alpha} b_m, \quad b_{-m}^* \mapsto e^{im\alpha} b_{-m}^*, \quad (10)$$

$$b_{-m} \mapsto e^{-im\alpha} b_{-m}, \quad b_m^* \mapsto e^{-im\alpha} b_m^*. \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, as explained in [11, 12], the evolution from $\{B_m(t_0)\}$ at time t_0 to $\{B_m(t)\}$ at time t is determined by a classical evolution operator $U(t, t_0)$ that has the block diagonal form:

$$B_m(t) = U_m(t, t_0) B_m(t_0), \quad (12)$$

$$U_m(t, t_0) = W(x_m) W(x_m^0)^{-1}, \quad (13)$$

where $x_m = mt$, $x_m^0 = mt_0$ and

$$W(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{W}(x) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{W}(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{W}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} c(x) & d(x) \\ d^*(x) & c^*(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

$$c(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi x}{8}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{i}{2x} \right) H_0(x) - i H_1(x) \right], \quad (15)$$

$$d(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi x}{8}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{i}{2x} \right) H_0^*(x) - i H_1^*(x) \right]. \quad (16)$$

Here, the symbol $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the zero 2×2 matrix, while H_0 and H_1 are the zeroth and first order Hankel functions of the second kind, respectively [25]. Note that $|c(x)|^2 - |d(x)|^2 = 1$, so that the map (12) is a Bogoliubov transformation.

The classical evolution matrices (13) take then the expression

$$U_m(t, t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_m(t, t_0) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{U}_m(t, t_0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{U}_m(t, t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_m(t, t_0) & \beta_m(t, t_0) \\ \beta_m^*(t, t_0) & \alpha_m^*(t, t_0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

with

$$\alpha_m(t, t_0) = c(x_m)c^*(x_m^0) - d(x_m)d^*(x_m^0), \quad (18)$$

$$\beta_m(t, t_0) = d(x_m)c(x_m^0) - c(x_m)d(x_m^0). \quad (19)$$

Finally, in the coordinates $\{B_m\}$, the symplectic form can also be decomposed in blocks,

$$\Omega(\{B_m^{(1)}\}, \{B_m^{(2)}\}) = \sum_m (B_m^{(1)})^T \Omega_m B_m^{(2)}, \quad (20)$$

$$\Omega_m = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \omega_m \\ \omega_m & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega_m = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

where $(B_m^{(1)})^T$ is the row vector transpose of $B_m^{(1)}$.

It is worth noticing at this stage that expressions (12) and (17) are not specific of the considered Gowdy model. They are in fact generic for systems whose classical evolution operator commutes with the action of the S^1 -translations and the θ -reversal transformation $b_m \leftrightarrow b_{-m}$. Of course, the functions $\alpha_m(t, t_0)$ and $\beta_m(t, t_0)$ are model dependent. For instance, $\alpha_m(t, t_0) = e^{-im(t-t_0)}$ and $\beta_m(t, t_0) = 0 \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$ in the case of the free massless scalar field.

In order to obtain a Fock quantisation of the system, one must now introduce a complex Hilbert space structure in phase space. This is done by choosing a complex structure J which, together with the symplectic form, defines the real part of the inner product [7, 26]. The imaginary part of this inner product is determined by the symplectic form itself. The specific complex structure J_0 chosen in [11, 12] is given in the $\{B_m\}$ basis by a block diagonal matrix, where each 4×4 block has the form $(J_0)_m = \text{diag}(i, -i, i, -i)$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_0$ be the one-particle Hilbert space determined by J_0 , $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ the corresponding (symmetric) Fock space and $|0\rangle$ the standard cyclic vector (i.e. the vacuum or zero-particle state). The variables $\{B_m\}$ are precisely those promoted to the creation and annihilation operators of the Fock representation defined by J_0 . In particular, the vacuum is characterised by the equations $\hat{b}_m|0\rangle = \hat{b}_{-m}|0\rangle = 0 \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$. From definitions (9), the complex structure J_0 can then be understood as the natural one corresponding to a free massless dynamics for the scalar field ξ in our flat background.

Furthermore, since the chosen complex structure J_0 is invariant under the group of translations T_α , one obtains an invariant unitary implementation of this gauge group, so

that $\forall \alpha \in S^1$ there exists a unitary operator $\hat{T}_\alpha$ such that

$$\hat{T}_\alpha \hat{b}_m \hat{T}_\alpha^{-1} = \widehat{T_\alpha b_m} = e^{im\alpha} \hat{b}_m \quad (22)$$

and

$$\hat{T}_\alpha |0\rangle = |0\rangle. \quad (23)$$

Most importantly, it was proved in [11, 12] that the dynamics is also unitarily implementable in this Fock representation, namely, there are unitary operators $\hat{U}(t, t_0)$ which satisfy

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) \hat{b}_m \hat{U}^{-1}(t, t_0) = U(\widehat{t, t_0}) \hat{b}_m = \alpha_m(t, t_0) \hat{b}_m + \beta_m(t, t_0) \hat{b}_{-m}^\dagger \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (24)$$

In contrast with the situation found with the group of S^1 -translations, the complex structure J_0 is not invariant under dynamical evolution, and hence neither is the cyclic vector $|0\rangle$ [11, 12].

To conclude this section, let us remind that a symplectic transformation A is unitarily implementable on a Fock space defined by a complex structure J if and only if its antilinear part $A_J = (A + JAJ)/2$ is Hilbert-Schmidt on the one-particle Hilbert space defined by J [27, 28]. An equivalent formulation is that $J - AJA^{-1}$ be Hilbert-Schmidt. In the case of the considered Fock representation for the Gowdy model, the condition of a unitary implementation of the dynamics becomes $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\beta_m(t, t_0)|^2 < \infty$, a finiteness that was proved in [11, 12].

3. TRANSLATION INVARIANT COMPLEX STRUCTURES

We now turn to the issue of determining the complex structures that are invariant under the group of S^1 -translations. We remember that a complex structure J is a *real* linear map on phase space whose square is minus the identity. Therefore, J must commute with complex conjugation and $J^2 = -\mathbf{1}$. On the other hand, J must be compatible with the symplectic structure, namely, J must be a symplectic transformation and the bilinear map defined on phase space by $\Omega(J\cdot, \cdot)$ must be positive definite, so that $\{\Omega(J\cdot, \cdot) - i\Omega(\cdot, \cdot)\}/2$ provides an inner product [7].

To these general properties we then add the following requirement.

Requirement 1 *We consider only complex structures J that are invariant under the group of translations (5), i.e. such that $T_\alpha^{-1}JT_\alpha = J \forall \alpha \in S^1$.*

This requirement restricts considerably the admissible complex structures, although the possible choices are still infinite. We shall refer to such complex structures simply as invariant ones.

Proposition 1 *A compatible invariant complex structure J is necessarily block diagonal in the $\{B_m\}$ basis, each 4×4 block being a matrix of the form*

$$J_m = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{J}_m & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{J}_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{J}_m = \begin{pmatrix} i\rho_m & \tilde{\rho}_m e^{i\delta_m} \\ \tilde{\rho}_m e^{-i\delta_m} & -i\rho_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_m \geq 0$ and $\rho_m = \sqrt{1 + \tilde{\rho}_m^2} \geq 1 \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$. The complex structure J_0 corresponds to $\tilde{\rho}_m = 0 \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: Employing transformations (10) and (11), it is straightforward to see that invariance under S^1 -translations requires a block diagonal form like that given in the first equation in (25), except for the fact that the two nonvanishing entries may in principle be different 2×2 matrices. Commutation with complex conjugation allows then to express any of these matrices in terms of the other. In addition, since J is a complex structure, $-J_m^2$ must equal the (4×4) identity matrix. Moreover, compatibility with the symplectic structure (20) implies that $J_m^T \Omega_m J_m = \Omega_m$ and that $J_m^T \Omega_m$ must be positive definite. It is a simple exercise to check that these conditions lead precisely to the above general form for J_m . $\square$

It turns out that the freedom in the choice of compatible invariant complex structure is equivalent to that in performing a certain type of symplectic transformations. More specifically, a direct computation shows the following result.

Proposition 2 *Every compatible invariant complex structure J is related to J_0 by a symplectic transformation K_J (i.e. $J = K_J J_0 K_J^{-1}$) that is block diagonal, with 4×4 blocks of the form*

$$(K_J)_m = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathcal{K}_J)_m & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathcal{K}_J)_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\mathcal{K}_J)_m = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_m & \lambda_m \\ \lambda_m^* & \kappa_m^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where $|\kappa_m|^2 - |\lambda_m|^2 = 1$. Furthermore, there is a one-to-one correspondence between compatible invariant complex structures and symplectic transformations of this form with positive coefficients κ_m . Explicitly, $\kappa_m = \sqrt{(\rho_m + 1)/2}$ and $\lambda_m = i\tilde{\rho}_m e^{i\delta_m} / \sqrt{2(\rho_m + 1)}$.

Remember that the Fock representations defined by J and J_0 are equivalent if and only if $J - J_0$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator on $\mathcal{H}_0$. In our case, using the above expressions, this immediately translates into the condition $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_m|^2 (1 + 2|\lambda_m|^2) < \infty$. This is in turn equivalent to the summability of the sequence $\{|\lambda_m|^2\}$. On the one hand, we have $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_m|^2 \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_m|^2 (1 + 2|\lambda_m|^2)$, so the former of these sums is finite if so is the latter. On the other hand, if $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_m|^2 < \infty$, all but at most a finite number of elements in $\{|\lambda_m|^2\}$ are smaller than the unity, so that $|\lambda_m|^4 < |\lambda_m|^2$ for them, and hence $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_m|^2 (1 + 2|\lambda_m|^2)$ must also be finite.

In the following, we further restrict our attention to compatible invariant complex structures J that give rise to a unitary implementation of the dynamics, i.e. such that the antilinear part of the evolution operator, $\{U(t, t_0) + JU(t, t_0)J\}/2$, is Hilbert-Schmidt with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J = \{\Omega(J\cdot, \cdot) - i\Omega(\cdot, \cdot)\}/2$ for all (strictly positive) values of t and t_0 . It is straightforward to see that this Hilbert-Schmidt condition can be reformulated as follows.

Proposition 3 *Let U be a symplectic transformation and J and J_0 two complex structures that are related by another symplectic transformation K_J , $J = K_J J_0 K_J^{-1}$. Then the antilinear part $(U + JUJ)/2$ is Hilbert-Schmidt with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J$ if and only if the J_0 antilinear part of $K_J^{-1}UK_J$, namely $(K_J^{-1}UK_J + J_0 K_J^{-1}UK_J J_0)/2$, is Hilbert-Schmidt with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{J_0}$.*

Applying this result to the symplectic transformation $U(t, t_0)$ provided by the evolution, the existence of a unitary implementation of the dynamics with respect to J becomes equivalent to that of a unitary implementation of $U^J(t, t_0) = K_J^{-1}U(t, t_0)K_J$ with respect to J_0 for all possible values of t and t_0 . Taken then into account the general form of $U(t, t_0)$ and K_J , given in equations (17) and (26), one gets an expression for $U^J(t, t_0)$ which is again of the type (17) but with different coefficients $\alpha_m(t, t_0)$ and $\beta_m(t, t_0)$, namely

$$U_m^J(t, t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_m^J(t, t_0) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{U}_m^J(t, t_0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{U}_m^J(t, t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_m^J(t, t_0) & \beta_m^J(t, t_0) \\ \beta_m^{J*}(t, t_0) & \alpha_m^{J*}(t, t_0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

with

$$\alpha_m^J(t, t_0) = |\kappa_m|^2 \alpha_m(t, t_0) - |\lambda_m|^2 \alpha_m^*(t, t_0) + \kappa_m^* \lambda_m^* \beta_m(t, t_0) - \kappa_m \lambda_m \beta_m^*(t, t_0), \quad (28)$$

$$\beta_m^J(t, t_0) = 2i \text{Im}[\alpha_m(t, t_0)] \kappa_m^* \lambda_m + (\kappa_m^*)^2 \beta_m(t, t_0) - \lambda_m^2 \beta_m^*(t, t_0). \quad (29)$$

Here, $\text{Im}[z]$ denotes the imaginary part of z . Of course, $U^J(t, t_0)$ is a symplectic transformation:

$$|\alpha_m^J(t, t_0)|^2 - |\beta_m^J(t, t_0)|^2 = |\alpha_m(t, t_0)|^2 - |\beta_m(t, t_0)|^2 = 1. \quad (30)$$

The condition for a unitary implementation of the dynamics in the J representation is thus equivalent to the square summability of $\{\beta_m^J(t, t_0)\}$, i.e. that $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\beta_m^J(t, t_0)|^2$ exists for all (strictly positive) t and t_0 .

4. UNIQUENESS OF THE COMPLEX STRUCTURE

In this section we shall prove that any compatible invariant complex structure J that allows a unitary implementation of the dynamical evolution provides a Fock representation that is unitarily equivalent to that defined by J_0 .

As we mentioned in the introduction, this proof applies not only to the Gowdy model, but to a broader class of field dynamics. More precisely, we consider classical evolutions of the form (12) and (17) such that the functions $\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ satisfy the following condition.

Condition 1 *There exist a (strictly positive) value of t_0 and a constant $\delta \in (0, \pi)$ such that, for every measurable set $\tilde{E}_\delta \subset [0, \pi]$ with Lebesgue measure $\mu(\tilde{E}_\delta) > \pi - \delta$,*

$$\int_{\tilde{E}_\delta} \{1 - (\text{Re}[\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)])^2\} d\tau > \Delta(\tilde{E}_\delta) \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \quad (31)$$

for certain strictly positive bounds $\Delta(\tilde{E}_\delta) > 0$.

Besides, we assume that the functions $\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ and $\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ are measurable functions of the elapsed time $\tau = t - t_0$ on the closed interval $[0, \pi]$ for (at least) the fixed value of t_0 given by condition 1. This additional measurability condition is extremely mild and is obviously fulfilled (for any choice of t_0) in the linearly polarised Gowdy cosmologies [see definitions (18) and (19)], as well as in the case of the free massless field. On the other hand, we postpone to section 5 the verification that condition 1 is satisfied in the Gowdy model (and by the free massless field). Of course, we are also assuming that the dynamics admits a unitary implementation in the introduced representation J_0 .

As stated above, we consider exclusively representations J where the evolution can also be implemented as a unitary transformation. For an invariant representation of this kind, let us write expression (29) for $\beta_m^J(t, t_0)$ in a more convenient form. We shall call ϕ_m and φ_m the phases of κ_m and λ_m , respectively, and $\tilde{\beta}_m(t, t_0) = \beta_m(t, t_0)e^{-i(\phi_m + \varphi_m)}$.

Multiplying equation (29) by $e^{i(\phi_m - \varphi_m)}$, we obtain after a trivial calculation

$$2i|\kappa_m||\lambda_m|\text{Im}[\alpha_m + \tilde{\beta}_m] = e^{i(\phi_m - \varphi_m)}\beta_m^J - \text{Re}[\tilde{\beta}_m] - i(|\kappa_m| - |\lambda_m|)^2\text{Im}[\tilde{\beta}_m], \quad (32)$$

where $\text{Re}[z]$ is the real part of z and we have obviated the time dependence. To further manipulate this relation, we shall use the following (general) inequalities

$$|y + z|^2 \leq 2|y|^2 + 2|z|^2, \quad (33)$$

$$(\text{Im}[y + z])^2 \geq \frac{a}{1+a} (\text{Im}[z])^2 - a|y|^2 \quad \forall a \geq 0, \quad (34)$$

$$|\kappa_m| - |\lambda_m| \leq 1 \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (35)$$

The first one can be deduced by employing the triangle inequality $|y + z| \leq |y| + |z|$. The second one is a consequence of the fact that $(\sqrt{1+a}\text{Im}[y] + \text{Im}[z]/\sqrt{1+a})^2 \geq 0$. Finally, the third one follows from the relation $|\kappa_m|^2 = 1 + |\lambda_m|^2$. Using these inequalities, together with $|\kappa_m| \geq 1$ and $|\alpha_m(t, t_0)|^2 - |\beta_m(t, t_0)|^2 = 1$, it is not difficult to show from equation (32) that

$$\frac{2a}{1+a}|\lambda_m|^2 \{1 - (\text{Re}[\alpha_m(t, t_0)])^2 - a|\beta_m(t, t_0)|^2\} \leq 2|\beta_m(t, t_0)|^2 + |\beta_m^J(t, t_0)|^2 \quad (36)$$

for all (strictly positive) values of t and t_0 and $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \geq 0$.

Let us substitute $t = t_0 + \tau$ from now on and restrict our analysis to the interval $\tau \in [0, \pi]$. In addition, let us sum equation (36) over m , from $m = 1$ up to a finite but *generic* $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2a}{1+a} \sum_{m=1}^N |\lambda_m|^2 \{1 - (\text{Re}[\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)])^2 - a|\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2\} \leq \\ \sum_{m=1}^N (2|\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 + |\beta_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We now analyse the right hand side of this inequality. We restrict all considerations to the fixed value of t_0 supplied by condition 1 and regard

$$\sum_{m=1}^N |\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m=1}^N |\beta_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 \quad (38)$$

as functions of τ defined on $[0, \pi]$. The imposed measurability condition on $\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ and $\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ together with equations (28) and (29) guarantee that $\alpha_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ and $\beta_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ are again measurable functions of τ on $[0, \pi]$, and therefore the same

is true for the sums (38) for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Note also that the limit of these sums when $N \rightarrow \infty$ exists for all values of τ , because the dynamics is unitarily implementable both in the J_0 and the J representations (see end of section 3). Moreover, we have the following integrability result.

Lemma 1 *For the considered fixed value of t_0 and $\forall \delta > 0$, there exist a measurable set $E_\delta \subset [0, \pi]$ with Lebesgue measure $\mu(E_\delta) > \pi - \delta$ and a positive number I_δ such that*

$$\int_{E_\delta} \sum_{m=1}^N (2|\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 + |\beta_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2) d\tau \leq I_\delta \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (39)$$

Proof: We present a proof that is based on Egorov's theorem, which can be stated as follows (see e.g. [29]).

Theorem 1 (Egorov's theorem) *Let E be a set of finite measure and $f_n(\tau)$ a sequence of measurable functions converging (possibly only almost everywhere) to a function $f(\tau)$ on E . Then, $\forall \delta > 0$, there exists a measurable set $E_\delta \subset E$ with $\mu(E_\delta) > \mu(E) - \delta$ and such that the convergence is uniform on E_δ .*

In our case $E = [0, \pi]$, $f_N(\tau) = \sum_{m=1}^N (2|\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 + |\beta_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2)$ with fixed t_0 and

$$f(\tau) = 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\beta_m^J(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2. \quad (40)$$

For every choice of $\delta > 0$, let E_δ be as in the theorem. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{E_\delta} [f_{N_1}(\tau) - f_{N_2}(\tau)] d\tau \right| &\leq \int_{E_\delta} |f_{N_1}(\tau) - f_{N_2}(\tau)| d\tau \leq \pi \sup_{E_\delta} |f_{N_1}(\tau) - f_{N_2}(\tau)| \\ &\leq \pi \sup_{E_\delta} |f_{N_1}(\tau) - f(\tau)| + \pi \sup_{E_\delta} |f_{N_2}(\tau) - f(\tau)|, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where we have employed that $\mu(E_\delta) < \pi$. For any number $\epsilon > 0$, the above upper bound is clearly smaller than ϵ if N_1 and N_2 are greater than a certain integer N_ϵ , because the convergence is uniform on E_δ . Thus, the sequence of integrals $I_\delta^{(N)} = \int_{E_\delta} f_N(\tau) d\tau$ is Cauchy, and therefore converges, i.e. $I_\delta = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} I_\delta^{(N)}$ exists. Since the partial sums $f_N(\tau)$ form an increasing sequence, $f_{N+1}(\tau) \geq f_N(\tau)$, we have $I_\delta^{(N)} \leq I_\delta^{(N+1)}$, and hence $I_\delta^{(N)} \leq I_\delta \forall N \in \mathbb{N}$. $\square$

We finally are in conditions to prove the uniqueness of the Fock quantisation.

Proposition 4 *If condition 1 is satisfied, $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_m|^2$ is finite.*

Proof: We take values for t_0 and δ such that condition 1 holds, and integrate both sides of relation (37) over the corresponding set E_δ provided by lemma 1. Then, condition 1 guarantees that inequality (31) is satisfied with $\tilde{E}_\delta = E_\delta$. Employing this and equation (39) (which also provides the bound $2 \int_{E_\delta} |\beta_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)|^2 d\tau \leq I_\delta, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$), we conclude that

$$\frac{a}{1+a} \sum_{m=1}^N |\lambda_m|^2 [2\Delta(E_\delta) - aI_\delta] \leq I_\delta \quad \forall a \geq 0, \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (42)$$

Choosing a such that $0 < a < 2\Delta(E_\delta)/I_\delta$, we see that the partial sums $\sum_{m=1}^N |\lambda_m|^2$ form a bounded increasing sequence:

$$\sum_{m=1}^N |\lambda_m|^2 \leq \frac{(1+a)I_\delta}{a[2\Delta(E_\delta) - aI_\delta]} < \infty \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (43)$$

This guarantees that $\sum_{m=1}^\infty |\lambda_m|^2$ is finite. $\square$

Since the existence of this sum is the condition for unitary equivalence of the Fock representations determined by the two considered complex structures, our result proves that (modulo this unitary equivalence) there is in fact a unique choice of compatible invariant complex structure that permits the unitary implementation of the dynamics when condition 1 (and the measurability condition on the coefficients of the classical evolution operator) is satisfied.

5. COMPLETION OF THE PROOF FOR THE GOWDY MODEL

To complete the proof of uniqueness of the Fock quantisation of the linearly polarised Gowdy model, we still need to show that condition 1 is satisfied in this case. Remember that the functions $\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ are given then by equation (18). For such functions, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *Given any number $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists a constant $T_\epsilon > 0$ such that, $\forall t_0 > T_\epsilon$, $\tau \in [0, \pi]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$1 - (\operatorname{Re}[\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)])^2 \geq \sin^2(m\tau) - 26\epsilon. \quad (44)$$

Proof: Using expression (18), it is straightforward to see that

$$\operatorname{Re}[\alpha_m(t, t_0)] \leq \operatorname{Re}[c(mt)c^*(mt_0)] + |d(mt)||d(mt_0)| \quad (45)$$

with $t = t_0 + \tau$. On the other hand, remembering definitions (15) and (16) and the asymptotic behaviour of the Hankel functions [25], one can check that the functions $d(x)$ and $C(x) = c(x) - e^{i\pi/4}e^{-ix}$ tend to zero when $x \rightarrow \infty$. So, given any $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists a constant T_ϵ such that

$$|d(x)| \leq \epsilon, \quad |C(x)| = |c(x) - e^{i\pi/4}e^{-ix}| \leq \epsilon \quad \forall x > T_\epsilon. \quad (46)$$

Since $m \geq 1$ and $t = t_0 + \tau \geq t_0$ with $\tau \in [0, \pi]$, the above inequalities are valid $\forall t_0 > T_\epsilon$ when x equals either mt or mt_0 .

In particular, $\forall t_0 > T_\epsilon$, we obtain

$$\operatorname{Re}[\alpha_m(t, t_0)] \leq \operatorname{Re}[c(mt)c^*(mt_0)] + \epsilon^2, \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |c(mt)c^*(mt_0) - e^{-im(t-t_0)}|^2 &= \left| C(mt)c^*(mt_0) + e^{-i(mt-\frac{\pi}{4})}C^*(mt_0) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2(|c^*(mt_0)|^2 + 1)\epsilon^2 \leq 10\epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In the last line we have used equation (33) and $|c^*(mt_0)|^2 \leq 4$, a bound that follows from equation (46) for $\epsilon \leq 1$. Direct consequences of these inequalities are

$$\operatorname{Re}[c(mt)c^*(mt_0)] \leq \cos(m\tau) + \sqrt{10}\epsilon \quad (49)$$

$$(\operatorname{Re}[\alpha_m(t, t_0)])^2 \leq \cos^2(m\tau) + 26\epsilon. \quad (50)$$

To arrive at this last equation, we have employed relations (47) and (49) and the fact that $|\cos(m\tau)| \leq 1$ and $\epsilon^2 \leq \epsilon$ when $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$. The lemma follows trivially from (50). $\square$

Let us then take any number $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and a fixed $t_0 > T_\epsilon$ according to lemma 2 and, for $\delta \in (0, \pi)$, integrate relation (44) over τ on arbitrary sets $\tilde{E}_\delta \subset [0, \pi]$ with $\mu(\tilde{E}_\delta) > \pi - \delta$. Calling $\overline{E}_\delta$ the complement of $\tilde{E}_\delta$ with respect to $[0, \pi]$, so that $\mu(\overline{E}_\delta) < \delta$, we obtain $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{E}_\delta} \{1 - (\operatorname{Re}[\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)])^2\} d\tau &\geq \int_{\tilde{E}_\delta} \sin^2(m\tau) d\tau - 26\epsilon\pi \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2} - \int_{\overline{E}_\delta} \sin^2(m\tau) d\tau - 26\epsilon\pi \\ &\geq \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta - 26\epsilon\pi, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where in the last step we have used $\sin^2(m\tau) \leq 1$. We see that, as far as we choose $\delta < \pi/2$ and $\epsilon < (\pi - 2\delta)/(52\pi)$, the sequence of integrals (51) $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}$ admit a strictly

positive lower bound for every choice of the set $\tilde{E}_\delta$ and for any choice of fixed value of $t_0 > T_\epsilon$. Therefore, condition 1 is indeed fulfilled in the linearly polarised Gowdy model.

It is not difficult to realise that the basis of the above proof resides in the fact that, owing to the asymptotic behaviour of the Gowdy model at large times [11, 12], the coefficients $\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)$ of the classical evolution operator in the $\{B_m\}$ basis approach their counterparts for the free massless scalar field in the limit $t_0 \rightarrow \infty$. In the massless case, the potential term $\xi/(4t^2)$ is absent in equation (4) and, as already mentioned,

$$\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0) = e^{-im\tau} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (52)$$

One can see that these functions satisfy condition 1. Essentially, this explains that the same occurs for the Gowdy model, taking into account its asymptotic behaviour.

In more detail, direct substitution of expressions (52) in the integrals (51) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{E}_\delta} \{1 - (\operatorname{Re}[\alpha_m(t_0 + \tau, t_0)])^2\} d\tau &= \int_{\tilde{E}_\delta} \sin^2(m\tau) d\tau \\ &\geq \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

for all choices of t_0 , $\delta \in (0, \pi)$ and $\tilde{E}_\delta$ with $\mu(\tilde{E}_\delta) > \pi - \delta$. Restricting δ to be smaller than $\pi/2$, we deduce the existence of a strictly positive infimum for all wavenumbers m , so that the condition is satisfied. Hence, our proof of uniqueness is also valid for a free massless scalar field propagating in a flat background with S^1 spatial sections.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER COMMENTS

In this work, we have analysed uniqueness criteria for the Fock representation of a real scalar field satisfying a Klein-Gordon-like equation in a flat 1+1 dimensional background with the spatial topology of S^1 , assuming that the field equations are invariant under S^1 -translations. We have proved that, if the complex structure ^[§§] is invariant under the group of S^1 -translations and allows a unitary implementation of the dynamics, then the Fock representation is unique up to unitary transformations, provided that the dynamics satisfies certain conditions. In particular, these conditions guarantee that the time average of some sequence of functions that are related with the coefficients of the evolution

[§§] The complex and the symplectic structures must be compatible, with the canonical momentum of the field given by its time derivative.

operator possesses a strictly positive infimum. We have also shown that these conditions are fulfilled in the field description of the linearly polarised Gowdy T^3 model introduced in [11, 12], as well as in the case of the free massless scalar field.

The description of the Gowdy model formulated in [11, 12] involves an almost complete choice of gauge (including deparameterisation) and a choice of field parameterisation for the spatial metric. Our analysis demonstrates that, once those choices have been made, the invariance under S^1 -translations and the unitary implementation of the evolution pick out a unique Fock quantisation. Moreover, in the considered description of the Gowdy model, the demand of invariance under S^1 -translations is well justified because these translations are in fact a gauge group. Its generator corresponds then to a constraint to be imposed *à la Dirac* on the kinematical Fock space in order to arrive at the Hilbert space of physical states. From this perspective, unitary implementation of the dynamics is synonymous of uniqueness in the Fock quantisation of the linearly polarised Gowdy T^3 cosmologies.

Our line of reasoning to prove the uniqueness of the Fock representation has been the following. We have first shown that any complex structure J that is compatible with the symplectic form and commutes with the group of S^1 -translations has a very specific block diagonal form in the $\{B_m\}$ basis (8) (which is formed by the natural choice of annihilationlike and creationlike variables for the case of the free massless scalar field). We have then proved that all such complex structures can be obtained by means of certain symplectic transformations from a complex structure of reference, J_0 (namely, the structure which would be selected by the energy condition of [8] –or by invariance under S^1 -translations and dynamical evolution– if the scalar field were a free massless one). These symplectic transformations have precisely the same type of block diagonal form presented by the invariant complex structures. We have established a one-to-one correspondence between a subset of such symplectic transformations K_J and the invariant complex structures J , so that the choice of K_J captures all the freedom available in the construction of the Fock representation.

Using this result, we have reformulated the condition of unitary implementation of the classical evolution operator U in the invariant representation J as the unitary implementation of $K_J^{-1}UK_J$ in the J_0 representation. Assuming this unitarity and taking for granted that of U in the J_0 representation (as it is certainly the case for the Gowdy model

and the free massless field), we have arrived at an inequality that relates the antilinear parts of U and $K_J^{-1}UK_J$ with the antilinear part of K_J [see equation (37)]. In this inequality, nonetheless, (the square modulus of) the coefficients of the antilinear part of K_J appear modulated by certain functions, determined by the classical evolution operator U . These functions may in principle oscillate and change their sign as the time τ elapsed from the Cauchy surface of reference t_0 varies. To overcome this complication, the idea is to average over τ , eliminating in this way any irrelevant oscillatory behaviour and local change of positivity of the modulating functions.

Introducing the very mild assumption that the coefficients of the classical evolution operator U are measurable functions of τ on $[0, \pi]$ for fixed t_0 , Egorov's theorem guarantees that there exist subsets in that closed interval where the (trace of the square norm of the) antilinear parts of U and of $K_J^{-1}UK_J$ are integrable. This assumption of measurability is satisfied both in the free massless case and in the Gowdy model. Using this result, uniqueness follows if, on any of those subsets of integrability and for a suitable choice of the Cauchy surface t_0 ^[¶¶], the corresponding time averages of all the modulating functions for the different wavenumbers m have a strictly positive infimum. This last requirement on the dynamics ensures then that the antilinear part of K_J is Hilbert-Schmidt in the J_0 representation, so that the symplectic transformation admits a unitary implementation. As a consequence, the J and J_0 representations turn out to be unitarily equivalent.

Let us emphasise that, apart from the central role played by the symmetry under S^1 -translations, the only hypotheses made about the details of the system are the unitary implementation of the dynamics in the J_0 representation and the conditions that, at some fixed value of t_0 , the coefficients of the classical evolution operator are measurable functions of τ on $[0, \pi]$ and the corresponding modulating functions present a strictly positive infimum when averaged over τ (to be more precise, on any subset of $[0, \pi]$ whose Lebesgue measure exceeds $\pi - \delta$ for certain constant $\delta > 0$). We have verified these hypotheses both in the linearly polarised Gowdy model and in the free massless field. Actually, based on our proof that the averages have a strictly positive infimum for the Gowdy model, one may convince oneself that such a result can be generalised at least

[¶¶] Different choices of constant t -time Cauchy surfaces lead to unitarily equivalent quantisations because the dynamical evolution between those surfaces admits a unitary implementation in the J_0 representation.

to those real field dynamics where all the coefficients of the classical evolution operator converge uniformly in τ and in the wavenumber m to their free massless counterparts, either at a fixed value of t_0 or asymptotically for infinitely large t_0 . This includes, e.g., those dynamics that coincide with the free massless one in the entire future of a Cauchy surface. In any of such circumstances, the difference between the considered coefficients and their free massless counterparts can be made as negligible as required for all $\tau \in [0, \pi]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with a suitable choice of t_0 . The existence of a strictly positive lower bound (independent of the wavenumber) on the averages for the system under study follows then from that of the free massless field. Therefore, uniqueness of the Fock quantisation holds also in these cases, provided that the classical evolution operator admits a unitary implementation in the considered (J_0) representation and that all of its coefficients (in the $\{B_m\}$ basis) are measurable functions of $\tau \in [0, \pi]$ for the chosen value of t_0 .

The compactness of the spatial sections of the background has certainly been crucial in this proof of uniqueness. In particular, the strict positivity of the infimum of the averaged modulating functions is lost when the topology is noncompact. In that case, the wavenumber m would cease to be discrete, taking any positive value. For instance, for the free massless field, whose modulating functions are $\sin^2 m\tau$, even the integral over the whole interval $[0, \pi]$ becomes as small as desired when $m \rightarrow 0$, so that a strictly positive lower bound $\forall m > 0$ does not exist. The same would happen for the analogue of the Gowdy model with noncompact spatial sections. In contrast, the dimension of the spatial sections does not seem to play such a decisive role in our discussion, in spite of the peculiarities that are usually tied with symmetries in 1+1 dimensions. The possible generalisation of our uniqueness result to higher dimensions will be the subject of future research.

Another issue which deserves some comments is the choice of J_0 as the complex structure of reference for the Fock quantisation of the Gowdy model. As we have mentioned, this complex structure can be regarded as the natural one associated with the free massless dynamics. In principle, one might thought that an alternative reasonable choice would be the complex structure $J_{M_{t_0}}$ that corresponds (e.g. via the energy condition [8]) to the free dynamics with constant mass $M_{t_0} = 1/(4t_0^2)$, namely, the instantaneous value of the

effective mass for the Gowdy model at the chosen Cauchy surface t_0 ^[***]. Nevertheless, the complex structure $J_{M_{t_0}}$ presents the disadvantage of its dependence on the choice of t_0 . On the other hand, it actually would lead to a unitarily equivalent Fock representation. Indeed, one can check that $J_{M_{t_0}} - J_0$ is Hilbert-Schmidt in the J_0 representation if and only if the sequence $\{\lambda_m(M_{t_0})\}$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lambda_m(M_{t_0}) = \frac{(m^2 + M_{t_0}^2)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{m}} - \frac{\sqrt{m}}{(m^2 + M_{t_0}^2)^{1/4}} \quad (54)$$

is square summable. This summability follows from that of $\{1/m^4\}$ taking into account that $|\lambda_m(M_{t_0})| \leq (1 + M_{t_0}^2)^{1/4} M_{t_0}^2 / (4m^2) \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M_{t_0} \neq 0$. The compact topology turns out again to be essential for the equivalence of the representations determined by J_0 and $J_{M_{t_0}}$, associated with different constant masses. For instance, it is well known that different masses correspond to inequivalent representations in the case of free scalar fields in Minkowski spacetime [30] (see also [31] for a detailed account of the role played in this respect by the long range behaviour.).

Let us finally clarify that, as one would expect, the choice of the complex structure J_0 for the quantisation of the Gowdy model is in fact equivalent (in the sense of the unitary equivalence of the Fock representations) to the prescription of [32], which appeals to the use of asymptotic complex structures. Since the dynamics of the Gowdy model approaches that of the free massless scalar field asymptotically (e.g., one may check in the Gowdy model that the time average of the field energy on any interval $[t_0, \infty)$ with $t_0 > 0$ equals the energy of the free massless scalar field), it is possible to establish a symplectomorphism between the spaces of smooth solutions for the Gowdy and the free massless fields, respectively. Employing this symplectomorphism to “pull back” the natural complex structure of the massless case, one obtains the following one for the Gowdy model [32]:

$$\tilde{J}_0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t_0, t) U_0(t, t_0) J_0 U_0(t_0, t) U(t, t_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t_0, t) J_0 U(t, t_0), \quad (55)$$

where U_0 denotes the classical evolution operator for the free massless dynamics. In the last identity, we have employed that J_0 is invariant under such an evolution operator.

[***] As an aside, let us point out that the complex structures that $J_{M_{t_0}}$ induces by time evolution differ however from J_{M_t} .

Making use of equations (15)-(19), it is a simple exercise to check that $\tilde{J}_0 - J_0$ is indeed Hilbert-Schmidt, so that both complex structures lead to equivalent Fock representations.

Acknowledgements

The authors are greatly thankful to A. Ashtekar for enlightening conversations and suggestions. This work was supported by the joint Spanish-Portuguese Project HP03-140, the Spanish MEC Project No. FIS2005-05736-C03-02, the CONACyT U47857-F grant and the Portuguese FCT Projects POCTI/FP/FNU/50226/2003 and POCTI/FIS/57547/2004. J. Cortez was funded by the Spanish MEC, No./Ref. SB2003-0168.

APPENDIX A: THE HAMILTONIAN AND THE VACUUM

In this appendix we show that a different way to guarantee the uniqueness of the Fock representation defined by a compatible invariant complex structure for the linearly polarised Gowdy model (up to unitary equivalence) consists in replacing the condition of unitary implementation of the dynamics by the stronger requirement that the Fock vacuum belong to the domain $\mathcal{D}(\hat{H})$ of the Hamiltonian operator.

In a system where time evolution is dictated by a self-adjoint Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}$, perturbative S -matrix analyses cannot be performed outside $\mathcal{D}(\hat{H})$. In particular, in a Fock representation of a field system, perturbative scattering processes will be well defined on the dense subspace formed by the states with a finite number of “particles” only if the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(\hat{H})$. We do not necessarily need to know how to calculate explicitly the action of the evolution operator $\hat{U}$ on the whole Hilbert space, instead we may just consider its series expansion and its action on (finite) “ n -particle” states $|n\rangle$.

However, if the vacuum fails to be in the domain of the Hamiltonian, one certainly cannot use the series expansion to evolve $|n\rangle$ states. A natural strategy to elude the technical complications posed by this problem consists in searching for a unitary, time independent Bogoliubov transformation that provides an alternative (yet unitarily equivalent) Fock representation whose new vacuum belongs to the domain of the Hamiltonian.

When there exist classical symmetries in the system, the requirement that they are unitarily implemented restricts the possible Fock representations and therefore the set of allowed Bogoliubov transformations. It might happen that, among the infinitely many inequivalent Fock representations of the field system, the demands of symmetry invariance and a well defined action of the Hamiltonian on the vacuum select just a single family of unitarily equivalent representations. We shall see that this occurs with the quantum description of the linearly polarised Gowdy model constructed in [11, 12].

In that quantum description, and employing the $\{B_m\}$ basis, time evolution in the non-zero mode part of the field sector is governed by the Hamiltonian [12]:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \omega_m(t) \left[\hat{b}_m^\dagger \hat{b}_m + \hat{b}_{-m}^\dagger \hat{b}_{-m} \right] + \rho_m(t) \left[\hat{b}_m \hat{b}_{-m} + \hat{b}_m^\dagger \hat{b}_{-m}^\dagger \right] \right\}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\omega_m(t) = m + \rho_m(t)$ and $\rho_m(t) = 1/(8mt^2)$. Since the sequence $\{\rho_m(t)\}$ is square summable (SS) for all $t \in R^+$, the vacuum state belongs indeed to $\mathcal{D}(\hat{H})$.

Remembering that any compatible invariant complex structure J can be obtained from the complex structure J_0 by means of a symplectic transformation K_J of the form (26), we can prove the uniqueness of the Fock quantisation by showing that, if the Bogoliubov transformation provided by K_J leads to a new vacuum in the domain of the Hamiltonian, then K_J admits a unitary implementation in the J_0 representation, i.e. $\{\lambda_m\}$ is SS. This Bogoliubov transformation is given by

$$b_m = \kappa_m a_m + \lambda_m a_{-m}^* \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \quad (\text{A2})$$

and a similar expression for b_{-m} with $\kappa_m = \kappa_{-m}$ and $\lambda_m = \lambda_{-m}$.

In the new representation, the Hamiltonian operator adopts the form

$$\hat{H}_J = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \eta_m(t) \left[\hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_m + \hat{a}_{-m}^\dagger \hat{a}_{-m} \right] + \gamma_m(t) \hat{a}_m \hat{a}_{-m} + \gamma_m^*(t) \hat{a}_m^\dagger \hat{a}_{-m}^\dagger \right\}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where the time dependent coefficients are

$$\eta_m(t) = \omega_m(t) (|\kappa_m|^2 + |\lambda_m|^2) + \rho_m(t) (\kappa_m \lambda_m + \kappa_m^* \lambda_m^*), \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\gamma_m(t) = 2\omega_m(t) \kappa_m \lambda_m^* + \rho_m(t) [(\kappa_m)^2 + (\lambda_m^*)^2]. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Let us then assume that $\{\lambda_m\}$ is *not* SS but that the “new” vacuum state $|0_J\rangle$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(\hat{H}_J)$, so that the sequence $\{\gamma_m(t)\}$ is SS. We shall show that this leads to a contradiction.

Writing $\kappa_m = |\kappa_m|e^{i\phi_m}$, $\lambda_m = |\lambda_m|e^{i\varphi_m}$ and using the relation $|\kappa_m|^2 = 1 + |\lambda_m|^2$ and the expressions of $\omega_m(t)$ and $\rho_m(t)$, we obtain

$$|\gamma_m(t)|^2 = [\Upsilon_m(t)]^2 + \frac{1}{64m^2t^4} \sin^2(\phi_m + \varphi_m), \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $\Upsilon_m(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\Upsilon_m(t) = 2m|\kappa_m||\lambda_m| + \frac{1}{8mt^2} \cos(\phi_m + \varphi_m) + \frac{1}{4mt^2} [|\kappa_m||\lambda_m| + |\lambda_m|^2 \cos(\phi_m + \varphi_m)]. \quad (\text{A7})$$

The last term in equation (A6) defines a summable sequence for all values of $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, since $\sin^2(\phi_m + \varphi_m) \leq 1$ and the Riemann function $Z(x)$ converges at $x = 2$. Thus, the square summability of $\gamma_m(t)$ amounts to that of $\Upsilon_m(t)$. We concentrate our attention on the latter from now on.

Let $T > 0$ be any strictly positive number and

$$M_T = \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} : |\lambda_m| > \frac{1}{8mT^2} \right\}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Since we are assuming that $\{\lambda_m\}$ is not SS, the set M_T must contain an infinite number of elements. For every $m \in M_T$,

$$0 < 2m|\kappa_m||\lambda_m| - \frac{1}{8mT^2} \leq 2m|\kappa_m||\lambda_m| + \frac{1}{8mT^2} \cos(\phi_m + \varphi_m), \quad (\text{A9})$$

because $m|\kappa_m| > 1$ and $|\cos(\phi_m + \varphi_m)| \leq 1$. In addition, remembering that $|\lambda_m| \neq 0$ for $m \in M_T$, we have

$$|\kappa_m||\lambda_m| + |\lambda_m|^2 \cos(\phi_m + \varphi_m) > 0. \quad (\text{A10})$$

It then follows from definition (A7) that

$$\Upsilon_m(T) > 2m|\kappa_m||\lambda_m| - \frac{1}{8mT^2} > 0 \quad \forall m \in M_T. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Moreover, employing again $m|\kappa_m| > 1$ and $|\lambda_m| > 1/(8mT^2)$ for $m \in M_T$, one concludes from the above inequality that $\Upsilon_m(T) > (2m|\kappa_m| - 1)|\lambda_m| > |\lambda_m|$. But then the sequence $\{\Upsilon_m(T)\}$ with $m \in M_T$ cannot be SS, because $\{\lambda_m\}$ with $m \in M_T$ is not. This clearly implies that neither $\{\Upsilon_m(T)\}$ nor $\{\gamma_m(T)\}$ are SS when m is allowed to run over the whole set $\mathbb{N}$, in spite of our original assumptions. Therefore a contradiction arises, signaling that if the vacuum state $|0_J\rangle$ is in the domain of the Hamiltonian, the Bogoliubov transformation (A2) necessarily admits a unitary implementation (in the J_0 representation). The two considered representations are thus unitarily equivalent, as we wanted to

show. Let us finally stress that unitarity of the Bogoliubov transformation (A2) is just a necessary condition, but not a sufficient one in order to ensure that the state $|0_J\rangle$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(\hat{H}_J)$.

-
- [1] Wald R M 1994 *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics* (Chicago: Chicago University Press)
 - [2] Simon B 1972 *Topics in Functional Analysis* ed R F Streater (London: Academic Press)
 - [3] Ashtekar A and Lewandowski J 2004 Background independent quantum gravity: A status report *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** R53
 - [4] Rovelli C 2004 *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press)
 - [5] Thiemann T 2001 Introduction to modern canonical quantum general relativity *Preprint* gr-qc/0110034
 - [6] Lewandowski J, Okolow A, Sahlmann H and Thiemann T 2005 Uniqueness of diffeomorphism invariant states on holonomy-flux algebras *Preprint* gr-qc/0504147
 - [7] See e.g. Corichi A, Cortez J and Quevedo H 2004 Schrödinger and Fock representation for a field theory on curved spacetime *Ann. Phys.* **313** 446
 - [8] Ashtekar A and Magnon A 1975 Quantum fields in curved space-times *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **346** 375
Ashtekar A and Magnon-Ashtekar A 1980 A curiosity concerning the role of coherent states in quantum field theory *Pramana* **15** 107
 - [9] Misner C W 1972 Minisuperspace *Magic without Magic: John Archibald Wheeler* ed J Klauder (San Francisco: Freeman)
 - [10] Torre C G 1999 Midisuperspace models of canonical quantum gravity *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38** 1081
 - [11] Corichi A, Cortez J and Mena Marugán G A 2006 Unitary evolution in Gowdy cosmology *Phys. Rev. D* **73** 041502
 - [12] Corichi A, Cortez J and Mena Marugán G A 2006 Quantum Gowdy T^3 model: A unitary description *Phys. Rev. D* **73** 084020
 - [13] Gowdy R H 1974 Vacuum space-times with two parameter spacelike isometry groups and compact invariant hypersurfaces: topologies and boundary conditions *Ann. Phys.* **83** 203

- [14] Misner C W 1973 A minisuperspace example: The Gowdy T^3 cosmology *Phys. Rev. D* **8** 3271
- [15] Berger B K 1974 Quantum graviton creation in a model universe *Ann. Phys.* **83** 458
 Berger B K 1975 Quantum cosmology: Exact solution for the Gowdy T^3 model *Phys. Rev. D* **11** 2770
 Berger B K 1984 Quantum effects in the Gowdy T^3 cosmology *Ann. Phys.* **156** 155
- [16] Husain V and Smolin L 1989 Exactly solvable quantum cosmologies from two Killing field reductions of general relativity *Nucl. Phys. B* **327** 205
- [17] Mena Marugán G A 1997 Canonical quantization of the Gowdy model *Phys. Rev. D* **56** 908
- [18] Pierri M 2002 Probing quantum general relativity through exactly soluble midi-superspaces. II: Polarized Gowdy models *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11** 135
- [19] Corichi A, Cortez J and Quevedo H 2002 On unitary time evolution in Gowdy T^3 cosmologies *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11** 1451
- [20] Cortez J and Mena Marugán G A 2005 Feasibility of a unitary quantum dynamics in the Gowdy T^3 cosmological model *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 064020
- [21] Torre C G 2002 Quantum dynamics of the polarized Gowdy T^3 model *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 084017
- [22] Jacobson T 1991 Unitarity, causality and quantum gravity *Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity* ed A Ashtekar and J Stachel (Boston: Birkhäuser)
- [23] Kramer D, Stephani H, MacCallum M and Herlt E 1980 *Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press)
- [24] Cho D H J and Varadarajan M 2006 Functional evolution of quantum cylindrical waves *Preprint* gr-qc/0605065
- [25] Abramowitz M and Stegun I A (ed) 1970 *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* 9th edn. (Nat. Bur. Stand. Appl. Math. Ser. No. 55) (Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Print Off.)
- [26] See e.g. Choquet-Bruhat Y, DeWitt-Morette C and Dillard-Bleick M 1996 *Analysis, Manifolds and Physics, Part I: Basics* (Amsterdam: Elsevier)
 Kay B S 1978 Linear spin-zero quantum fields in external gravitational and scalar fields I. A one particle structure for the stationary case *Commun. Math. Phys.* **62** 55
- [27] Shale D 1962 Linear symmetries of free boson fields *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **103** 149
- [28] Honegger R and Rieckers A 1996 Squeezing Bogoliubov transformations on the infinite

- CCR-algebra *J. Math. Phys.* **37** 4292
- [29] Kolmogorov A N and Fomin S V 1999 *Elements of the Theory of Functions and Functional Analysis* (New York: Dover)
 - [30] Reed M and Simon B 1975 *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness* (San Diego: Academic Press)
 - [31] Mourão J M, Thiemann T and Velhinho J M 1999 Physical properties of quantum field theory measures *J. Math. Phys.* **40** 2337
 - [32] Ashtekar A and Magnon-Ashtekar A 1980 A geometrical approach to external potential problems in quantum field theory *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **12** 205